

5 SEP 1973

AT2 9/10

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Logistics

SUBJECT: Environmentally Sensitive Equipment Facilities

REFERENCE: Your memo dated 20 July 73, same subject (and its attached study, dated 5 March 73)

DL 3 4144
22713

Frank:

1. I have somewhat ambivalent feelings about the subject report. It is certainly true that our environmentally sensitive equipment (ESE) space has had a "cut and paste" developmental history and that the ESE sites which have resulted are far from ideal. At the same time, however, I find it difficult to accept the solution proposed in the OL study, i.e., renovations on the first floor of Headquarters at an estimated cost of \$4.7 million.

2. The difficulties I have with the report's recommendations stem primarily from the following:

a. The report was conceptualized prior to recent DCI decisions on organizational and space changes concerning ADP consolidation. It seems logical that these major changes should affect the report's recommendations.

b. What was perhaps the worst ADPE space problem (AND/OEL) should be satisfactorily solved when AND/OEL moves its equipment into the present CRS computer room this fall.

c. The absorption of the CRS computer workload by OJCS and the release of the CRS Mod 155 computer system reduces the ADP floor space, electric power, and air conditioning requirements.

d. The eventual consolidation of ISD's computer operations with OJCS will have further impact on the amount of space, power, and air conditioning required.

e. The Mass Storage system, planned for OJCS, will also reduce floor space needs and the number of operating devices in OJCS.

f. OJCS is tending to place more input/output devices (printers, card-readers, etc.) in User areas. Such action will again reduce space, power, and air conditioning needs within the OJCS center.

g. The new computer systems are appreciably smaller in size. Conversion to these new systems should significantly relieve pressures on floor space.

h. Relocation of ESE equipment (most of it ADP equipment) to the first floor will cause significant dislocations in operations and will cost a great deal of money. We should relocate our ADP equipment only for very solid cause and only to a definitively suited environment.


On present evidence, it seems to me the cause or problem to be solved may not justify the \$4.7 million estimated cost. As I understand it, our ADP operations are not "down" very often because of the quality of site environment. It is my belief, also (after the 1972 ADP safety survey requested by the IP Board) that we are not unduly risking the safety of employees or equipment if we continue to use the ground floor facilities. That is, conditions, while far from ideal, are nonetheless judged tolerable from both the operational and safety points of view.

Further, the first floor site proposed in the OL study carries drawbacks with it. The study's proposal not only perpetuates the use of Headquarters space for machines but would divert prime Headquarters office space to machines and move people to much less desirable ground floor space. I would think also that use of any part of the Headquarters Building for ESE needs will end up as a compromise in quality relative to an especially designed overall site. In addition, the proposed plan appears to leave the OC facilities environmentally separate from the ADP facilities. I would tend to want to see both communications and ADP facilities in a common environment if we are going to go through the trauma and expense of construction and relocation.

3. In sum, I come out of this one with the following feelings:

a. The ESE site issue needs further analysis... especially taking into account the recent ADP organizational and space changes post-dating OL's report, and taking into account other factors, such as mentioned above.

b. Ideally, a simpler and less costly solution to major deficiencies in our ESE sites could be found. [Is it feasible to run cables or water hoses under the sub-floor (along the roof of the garage) or, conceivably, in vertical enclosures to the first floor for selected portions of the equipment?] If this is not possible, I would intuitively be attracted to the option of a new building for ESE within the Headquarters compound as the desired long-range solution. A new building could provide the best overall environment for ESE and would free the Headquarters Building of ESE usage, thereby maximizing the use of the Headquarters Building for people. I would like to see this new building option analyzed carefully in the light of present and projected conditions before any major decision on upgrading ESE sites is made.


Charles A. Briggs

Chairman, Information Processing Board

STAT

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/06/20 : CIA-RDP86-01019R000100240027-0

Approved For Release 2003/06/20 : CIA-RDP86-01019R000100240027-0